

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

-----x

DISH NETWORK L.L.C.,

23-cv-09071

Plaintiff

- vs -

**ANSWER**

MASSIVE WIRELESS, INC.,  
KHALED AKHTAR, RAYS IPTV LLC,  
MUMTAZUR REHMAN DAUD and  
DOES 1-10, d/b/a GLO TV.,

Defendants.

-----x

Defendants MASSIVE WIRELESS, INC. and KHALED AKHTAR, by their attorneys, The Law Offices of Andrew Moulinos, answering the Complaint of the Plaintiff respectfully show to the Court the following:

1. Deny each allegation contained in the paragraphs of the Complaint denominated therein as hereinafter set forth:

1, 2, 6, 7, 15, 16, 25, 26, 27, 28, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45,  
46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 54, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 73,  
74, 75, 76, 77 and 78.

2. Deny knowledge or information as to the allegations contained in paragraphs of the Complaint denominated therein as hereinafter set forth:

3, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35,  
52, 53, 55, 57, 58, 59 and 66.

3. Deny each allegation contained in the paragraphs of the Complaint  
denominated therein as hereinafter set forth, except refer to the court at the  
time of trial all agreements, documents, writings and questions of law for their  
validity, applicability, enforceability and legal effect:

14, 19 and 24.

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that the following affirmative defenses,  
without assuming the burden of proof on those matters for which plaintiff bears  
such burden, are hereinafter set forth as follows:

**FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

The complaint fails to state a cause of action upon which relief may be granted  
as against the answering defendants herein.

**SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

The damages allegedly sustained by the plaintiff herein were caused by parties

other than the answering defendants herein, or by parties other than their agents, servants and/or employees.

### **THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

Plaintiff's claims are barred in whole or in part because plaintiff has sustained no actual damages upon which plaintiff can legally recover.

### **FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

No conduct by the answering defendants herein was the proximate cause of any damages sustained by the plaintiff.

### **CROSS-CLAIMS AGAINST CO-DEFENDANTS**

1. At all times relevant herein, defendant DAUD and co-defendants solicited business relationship with answering defendants herein.
2. DAUD and co-defendants represented and misled answering defendants herein that they were authorized and had the right to sell the products plaintiff is complaining of.
3. Answering defendants were duped in believing the co-defendants.

4. Accordingly, if the Answering defendants herein be found liable for damages in this action, such liability will have been caused or contributed to, in whole or in part, by the negligence, carelessness and/or culpable conduct of the co-defendants and the Answering defendants herein will be entitled to indemnification and/or contribution therefor.

WHEREFORE, the Answering defendants demand:

1. Judgment dismissing plaintiff's complaint in the action, together with costs and disbursements thereof; and
2. Judgment against the co-defendants, for indemnification and contribution based upon apportionment of responsibility of the parties;
3. Together with the costs and attorneys fees incurred in this action, and such other and further relief as the Court may find just and proper.

Dated: Astoria, New York  
December 28, 2023

Respectfully Submitted

LAW OFFICES OF  
ANDREW MOULINOS  
By: s/Andrew Moulinos  
ANDREW MOULINOS, Esq. (AM 0217)  
MASSIVE WIRELESS, INC. and  
KHALED AKHTAR

23-52 31st Street  
Astoria, New York 11105  
(718) 545-2600